

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Gail Pace,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	C.A. No. 6:10-2797-HMH-JDA
	)	
vs.	)	<b>OPINION AND ORDER</b>
	)	
Crossmark and Debbie Ridgeway,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

This matter is before the court with the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Jacquelyn D. Austin, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 of the District of South Carolina.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff Gail Pace (“Pace”), proceeding pro se, asserts claims against Crossmark and Debbie Ridgeway under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (“Title VII”), as amended. On January 18, 2011, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rules 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Magistrate Judge Austin recommends granting Defendants’ motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Pace filed objections to the magistrate judge’s Report on June 13, 2011.

---

<sup>1</sup> The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Objections to the Report and Recommendation must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge, the court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that Pace's objections to the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the Report, and merely restate her claims.

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Austin's Report and Recommendation.

It is therefore

**ORDERED** that Defendants' motion to dismiss, docket number 22, is granted. It is further

**ORDERED** that Pace's motion to dismiss Defendant Debbie Ridgeway, docket number 48, is dismissed as moot.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.  
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina  
June 14, 2011

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The Plaintiff is hereby notified that she has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.